

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-20, 22-26, 28, 30, 33, 34 and 37 are pending.

Claims 1-17, 19-20, 22-25, 28, 30 and 33-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious over 5,802,468 to Gallant et al. ("Gallant") in view of U.S. Patent 6,216,007 to Harvinis et al. ("Harvinis"). Claims 18 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious over Gallant in view of Harvinis and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,905,957 to Olds ("Olds"). Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Gallant in view of U.S. Patent Publication 2005/0101323 to De Beer ("De Beer").

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courtesy of a telephonic interview on July 14, 2010. During that interview, the Applicant discussed the pending rejection and cited prior art. It is believed that the Examiner agreed the language in the pending claims, without amendment, does not read on the prior art. Specifically, the Examiner appeared to agree that having a removable module determine whether a mobile phone is in a subscriber area (as is claimed in independent claims 1, 33 and 37) is not shown in the prior art. Therefore, reproduced below, is almost a verbatim copy of the previously submitted arguments advocating this distinction with respect to the Gallant and Harvinis references. As understood, the Examiner requested that Applicant resubmit these arguments and the finality of the Office Action would be withdrawn.

In order to maintain a valid obviousness rejection, the Office Action must show: 1) that the prior art teaches all of the claimed limitations and 2) that is some reason to modify the prior art to produce the claimed invention. MPEP §2141. Both requirements are missing here.

**Rejections based on Gallant in view of Harvinis and Olds**

1. A combination of the cited prior art does not show the claimed invention

Among the limitations of independent claim 1, which are neither disclosed nor suggested even in a combination of the cited art are:

each mobile device comprising a module insertable into,  
removable from and distinct from the mobile device. . .  
wherein each module is configured to determine whether a  
respective mobile device is located inside the at least one subscriber  
territory.

Similarly, among the limitations of independent claim 33, which are neither disclosed nor suggested even in a combination of the cited art are:

determining, using a module insertable into, removable from,  
and distinct from the mobile device, whether the first identifier  
matches the second identifier; and  
informing a subscriber of the mobile device that the subscriber  
is within the subscriber territory when the first identifier matches the  
second identifier.

As discussed in prior Communications. The invention allows for moving the

process for determining whether a mobile station is disposed in a subscriber territory, from the mobile station itself, to a module distinct from the mobile station. The module may perform the determination processing as in claims 1 and 33 or may poll a determination unit that performs processing external from the mobile device as in claim 37.

The Office Action on pages 4-5 agrees that the above limitations are not shown in Gallant and points to Harvinis. However, Harvinis does not disclose a module that can determine whether a respective mobile device is located inside a subscriber territory as is claimed. Harvinis appears to teach a method for calculating a geographical location of a mobile terminal by applying Enhanced Observed Time Difference or GPS location calculation methods. Harvinis does not appear to show that a module can determine whether the location of the mobile device is in inside a subscriber territory.

Moreover, in Harvinis the calculation of the mobile station is carried out by a positioning measurement module ("PMM") within the mobile terminal and a location calculation module on a smart IC card which is separated from the PMM. The PMM includes an algorithm 202 specific to the positioning methods used. Harvinis, col. 4: lines 54-55. Therefore, in Harvinis, even the calculation of the mobile station is partly performed by the mobile station itself so that specially equipped mobile devices are required. In stark contrast, the present invention uses a module, which may be separated from the mobile device, to determine whether the mobile device is located in the

subscriber territory. A benefit of the invention is that no special application is required on the part of the mobile device to handle such a service.

Further, even a combination of Gallant and Harvinis does not appear to show a SIM card performing calculations based on an identifier as claimed in independent claim 33. The Office Action indicates that Gallant teaches using identifiers such as BTS identifiers to determine location information and then points to Harvinis as teaching location determination by a SIM card. However Harvinis does not show any ability of a SIM card to determine location based on identifiers. In fact, Harvinis explicitly teaches that transmittal of BTS identifiers to a mobile station is contrary to its goals because a mobile subscriber can manipulate the received information. Harvinis, Col. 4: lines 30-34. Therefore, even the combination of Gallant with Harvinis does not show the claimed limitations and Harvinis explicitly teaches against the proposed combination. Olds is not cited to show, and does not appear to show, the cited limitations.

## **2. There is no valid motivation to combine Gallant and Harvinis**

In addition, one with ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to modify Gallant in view of Harvinis as suggested in the Office Action. The Office Action states that the motivation to combine these two references is to achieve a benefit of transmission efficiency and service variety or that the modification is simply a rearranging of parts. One with ordinary skill in the art, given the motivation of providing better transmission

efficiency, would not be motivated to move the calculations in Gallant to a SIM card as shown in Harvinis. Transmission efficiency appears to be unrelated to this change. Further, such a modification is also not simply a rearranging of parts as suggested in the Office Action because a more complex and expensive SIM card is used.

Rejections based on Gallant in view of De Beer

Among the limitations of independent claim 37, which are neither disclosed nor suggested even in a combination of the cited art are:

each mobile device comprising a module insertable into,  
removable from and distinct from the mobile device. . .  
wherein each module is configured to poll a determination  
unit external from the mobile device and receive information from  
the determination unit regarding whether a respective mobile  
device is located inside the at least one subscriber territory.

In claim 37, the SIM module polls a determination unit external to the mobile device to determine whether the mobile device is located in a subscriber territory. The Office Action points to paragraphs 33, 37, 38, 66 and 67 in De Beer as showing this limitation. However the sections of De Beer cited in the Office Action relate to sending a routing table to the SIM card of a mobile device. The routing table does not appear to include information about whether the mobile device is located in a subscriber territory. In contrast, as the term suggests, the routing table appears to relate to aspects for routing data.

See, e.g., paragraph 38 of De Beer.

Therefore, it is asserted that independent claims 1, 33 and 37 are patentable over the cited prior art. Claims 2-20, 22-26, 28, 30 and 34 include the above referenced limitations of independent claims 1 and 33 respectively, and include additional limitations which, when combined with the limitations of claims 1 and 33 are also neither shown nor suggested in the art of record. It is asserted that these claims are patentable as well.

Reconsideration of the rejections of claims 1-20, 22-26, 28, 30, 33, 34 and 37 under 35 U.S.C. §103 is respectfully requested in light of the remarks above.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Steven Rubin  
Reg. No. 43,063  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

**DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP**  
1000 Woodbury Road, Suite 405  
Woodbury, New York 117973  
Telephone: 516-228-8484  
Facsimile: 516-228-8516